

Appl. No. 09/652,322
Amtd. dated September 27, 2004
Reply to Office action of July 22, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants received the Office Action dated July 22, 2004, in which the Examiner: (1) rejected claims 1-5, 13 and 28-29 as obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,970,232 ("Passint") and U.S. Patent No. 5,987,518 ("Gotwald"); (2) rejected claims 6-12 as obvious in view of Passint, Gotwald and U.S. Patent No. 6,282,195 ("Miller"); and (3) allowed claims 14-27 and 30-46. In this response, Applicants amend claim 1 and add claim 47. Based on the amendments and arguments presented herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Amended claim 1, in part, requires that "the router give higher priority to message packets associated with the network ports than to message packets associated with other microprocessor ports and wherein the router arbitrates between the network ports using a predetermined prioritization and a least-recently-granted prioritization." None of the references cited by the Examiner teaches or suggests these limitations.

Passint teaches prioritizing messages based on age and header information (see col. 11, lines 27-30 and 56-58). Gotwald teaches that priority can be based on source address, destination address, the data type and the connection type (see col. 4, lines 61-64). However, neither Passint nor Gotwald teaches or suggests a "router [that] give higher priority to message packets associated with the network ports than to message packets associated with other microprocessor ports and wherein the router arbitrates between the network ports using a predetermined prioritization and a least-recently-granted prioritization" as required in claim 1. None of the references cited by the Examiner, nor combinations of the references, teaches or suggests these limitations. For at least this reason, Applicants submit that claim 1 and all claims that depend from claim 1 are allowable.

Claim 47 requires that "the router arbitrates between the other microprocessor ports using a predetermined prioritization and a least-recently-granted prioritization." None of the references cited by the Examiner, nor

Appl. No. 09/652,322
Amdt. dated September 27, 2004
Reply to Office action of July 22, 2004

combinations of the references, teaches or suggests this limitation. For at least this additional reason, Applicants submit that claim 47 is allowable.

CONCLUSIONS

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan D. Christenson
PTO Reg. No. 54,036
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
AGENT FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400